

**Appendix B**

**COST ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE**

**FOR**

**CLARK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT AND  
MODERATE RISK WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN**

**October 22, 2008**

PLAN PREPARED FOR THE COUNTY OF: Clark

PLAN PREPARED FOR THE CITY OF: \_\_\_\_\_

PREPARED BY: Anita Largent

CONTACT TELEPHONE: 360-397-6118 ext. 4484 DATE: 8/2007

## DEFINITIONS

Please provide these definitions as used in the Solid Waste Management Plan and the Cost Assessment Questionnaire.

Throughout this document:

YR.1 shall refer to 2006.

YR.3 shall refer to 2008.

YR.6 shall refer to 2011.

Year refers to (circle one)

**calendar** (Jan 01 - Dec 31)

**fiscal** (Jul 01 - Jun 30)

1. **DEMOGRAPHICS:** To assess the generation, recycling and disposal rates of an area, it is necessary to have population data. This information is available from many sources (e.g., the State Data Book, County Business Patterns, or the State Office of Finance and Management).

### 1.1 Population

- 1.1.1 What is the **total** population of your County/City? <sup>a</sup>

YR.1 403,500 YR.3 428,073 YR.6 467,767

- 1.1.2 For counties, what is the population of the area **under your jurisdiction**? (Exclude cities choosing to develop their own solid waste management system.)

YR.1 403,500 YR.3 428,073 YR.6 467,767

### 1.2 References and Assumptions

- a. Population projections based on *2006 Population Trends for Washington State*; 2008 & 2011 estimated based on 3% annual increase – which is the annual increase between 2005 and 2006

2. **WASTE STREAM GENERATION:** The following questions ask for total tons recycled and total tons disposed. Total tons disposed are those tons disposed of at a landfill, incinerator, transfer station or any other form of disposal you may be using. If other please identify.

### 2.1 Tonnage Recycled

- 2.1.1 Please provide the total tonnage **recycled** in the base year, and projections for years three and six. <sup>b</sup>

YR.1 225,930 YR.3 230,449 YR.6 235,058

### 2.2 Tonnage Disposed

- 2.2.1 Please provide the total tonnage **disposed** in the base year, and projections for years three and six. <sup>c</sup>

YR.1 227,529 YR.3 288,630 YR.6 300,175

### 2.3 References and Assumptions

- b. *The Solid Waste Data Report – Clark County, WA*, 12/18/07 for 2006 tonnages; projected recycling tonnages increased annually by 2%

- c. *The Solid Waste Data Report – Clark County, WA*, 12/18/07 for 2006 tonnages; projected tonnages disposed increased annually by 4%

3. **SYSTEM COMPONENT COSTS:** This section asks questions specifically related to the types of programs currently in use and those recommended to be started. For each component (i.e., waste reduction, landfill, composting, etc.) please describe the anticipated costs of the program(s), the assumptions used in estimating the costs and the funding mechanisms to be used to pay for it. The heart of deriving a rate impact is to know what programs will be passed through to the collection rates, as opposed to being paid for through grants, bonds, taxes and the like.

### 3.1 Waste Reduction Programs & 3.2 Recycling Programs

- 3.1.1 & 3.2.1 Please list the solid waste programs and recycling programs which have been implemented and those programs which are proposed. If these programs are defined in the SWM plan please provide the page number. (Attach additional sheets as necessary.)

#### IMPLEMENTED

Please see Attachment "A" for all implemented Waste Reduction and Recycling Programs and associated costs. All of these programs directly related to the draft *Clark County Comprehensive Solid Waste and Moderate Risk Waste Management Plan*.

#### PROPOSED

Proposed changes in the draft *Clark County Comprehensive Solid Waste and Moderate Risk Waste Management Plan*:

- Evaluation of curbside recycling collection program
- Improvements to current (private) transfer facilities
- Construction of new (private) transfer facility
- Enhanced unsecured loads programs
- Registering recycling haulers
- Transfer facility ban on accepting moderate risk waste
- Policy limiting construction of landfills in Clark County

- 3.1.2 & 3.2.1 What are the costs, capital costs and operating costs for waste reduction programs implemented and proposed?

#### IMPLEMENTED

Please see Attachment "A" for all implemented Waste Reduction and Recycling Programs and associated costs for YR 1, YR 3 & YR 6. These costs are based on actual costs for YR 1 (2006). Costs for YR 3 and YR6 have been projected to increase 4% per year.

#### PROPOSED

None of the proposed programs will have a significant impact to the County's costs of the solid waste system.

3.1.3 & 3.2.1 Please describe the funding mechanism(s) that will pay the cost of the programs in 3.1.2 and 3.2.1.

IMPLEMENTED

Funding for all currently implemented Waste Reduction and Recycling Programs comes from several sources. The County currently contracts with Waste Connections (Columbia Resources Company) for transfer, transport and disposal of solid waste and for recycling processing and marketing. This contract provides the County with an annual administrative fee. The amount of the fee is set by contract (in lieu of a per ton rate) and increases annually by 82% of the CPI. Waste Connections also performs processing of recyclable materials under this same contract. Waste Connections pays the County, the City of Vancouver and the municipal recycling haulers a portion of the revenue received from marketing curbside recyclable materials. The recycling collection and yard debris collection service is performed by Waste Connections under contract with Clark County. Each of these collection contracts provides the County with a per-household fee. The County is receives grant funds from the Department of Ecology's Coordinated Prevention Grants. The County also receives interest earned on the solid waste fund and usually received miscellaneous revenue from a variety of sources.

None of the proposed programs will have a significant impact to the County's costs of the solid waste system

- The current recycling curbside collection contract is expiring and will be competitively bid; any changes to the recycling program will undergo a cost/benefit analysis as part of this procurement process
- Transfer facility improvements and construction of a new transfer facility has been incorporated into the contract extension with Waste Connections. There is not increase in the transfer facility tipping fees (other than allowed annual increases).
- Remaining proposed programs will have minimal cost impact to the County's budget for solid waste programs.

### 3.3 Solid Waste Collection Programs

#### 3.3.1 Regulated Solid Waste Collection Programs

Fill in the table below for each **WUTC regulated** solid waste collection entity in your jurisdiction. (Make additional copies of this section as necessary to record all such entities in your jurisdiction.)

**WUTC Regulated Hauler Name** Waste Connections, Inc.<sup>d</sup>  
**G-permit #** 253

	<u>YR. 1</u>	<u>YR. 3</u>	<u>YR. 6</u>
<b>RESIDENTIAL</b>			
- # of Customers	55,461	56,848	58,269
- Tonnage Collected	44,435	46,212	48,061
<b>COMMERCIAL</b>			
- # of Customers	4,917	5,040	5,166
- Tonnage Collected	59,533	61,914	64,391

d. YR. 1 information provided by Waste Connections, Inc. YR 3 & YR 6 estimated with a 2.5% annual increase in customers and a 4% annual increase in tonnages.

**WUTC Regulated Hauler Name** Basin Disposal  
**G-permit #** 118

Valid certificate but no operations at this time.

	<u>YR. 1</u>	<u>YR. 3</u>	<u>YR. 6</u>
<b>RESIDENTIAL</b>			
- # of Customers	n/a	n/a	n/a
- Tonnage Collected	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>COMMERCIAL</b>			
- # of Customers	n/a	n/a	n/a
- Tonnage Collected	n/a	n/a	n/a

3.3.2 Other (non-regulated) Solid Waste Collection Programs Fill in the table below for other solid waste collection entities in your jurisdiction. (Make additional copies of this section as necessary to record all such entities in your jurisdiction.)

**Hauler Name** Waste Connections, Inc. <sup>e</sup>

	<u>YR. 1</u>	<u>YR. 3</u>	<u>YR. 6</u>
# of Customers	51,780	53,075	54,401
Tonnage Collected	113,160	117,686	122,394

e. YR. 1 information provided by Waste Connections, Inc. YR 3 & YR 6 estimated with a 2.5% annual increase in customers and a 4% annual increase in tonnages.

### 3.4 Energy Recovery & Incineration (ER&I) Programs

(If you have more than one facility of this type, please copy this section to report them.)

3.4.1 Complete the following for each facility:

Name: n/a  
Location: n/a  
Owner: n/a  
Operator: n/a

3.4.2 What is the permitted capacity (tons/day) for the facility? n/a

3.4.3 If the facility is not operating at capacity, what is the average daily throughput?

YR.1 n/a YR.3 n/a YR.6 n/a

3.4.4 What quantity is estimated to be land filled which is either ash or cannot be processed.

YR.1 n/a YR.3 n/a YR.6 n/a

3.4.5 What are the expected capital costs and operating costs, for ER&I programs (not including ash disposal expense)?

YR.1 n/a YR.3 n/a YR.6 n/a

3.4.6 What are the expected costs of ash disposal?

YR.1 n/a YR.3 n/a YR.6 n/a

3.4.7 Is ash disposal to be: n/a on-site?  
n/a in county?  
n/a long-haul?

3.4.8 Please describe the funding mechanism(s) that will fund the costs of this component.

### 3.5 Land Disposal Program

(If you have more than one facility of this type, please copy this section to report them.)

3.5.1 Provide the following information for each **land disposal facility** in your jurisdiction which receives garbage or refuse generated in the county.

Landfill Name: n/a  
Owner: n/a  
Operator: n/a

- 3.5.2 Estimate the **approximate tonnage** disposed at the landfill by **WUTC regulated haulers**. If you do not have a scale and are unable to estimate tonnages, estimate using cubic yards, and indicate whether they are compacted or loose.<sup>1</sup>

YR.1     n/a     YR.3     n/a     YR.6     n/a    

- 3.5.3 Using the same conversion factors applied in 3.5.2, please estimate the **approximate tonnage** disposed at the landfill by other contributors.

YR.1     n/a     YR.3     n/a     YR.6     n/a    

- 3.5.4 Provide the cost of operating (including capital acquisitions) each landfill in your jurisdiction. For any facility that is privately owned and operated, skip these questions.

YR.1     n/a     YR.3     n/a     YR.6     n/a    

- 3.5.5 Please describe the funding mechanism(s) that will defray the cost of this component.

### 3.6 Administration Program

- 3.6.1 What is the budgeted cost for administering the solid waste and recycling programs and what are the major funding sources.

#### Budgeted Cost

Please see Attachment "A" which includes all Administration Costs for administering the solid waste and recycling programs. These costs are based on actual costs for YR 1 (2006). Costs for YR 3 and YR6 have been projected to increase 4% per year.

#### Funding Source

Funding for all solid waste system costs (including Administration Costs) comes from several sources as detailed in 3.1.3.

<sup>1</sup> Compacted cubic yards will be converted at a standard 600 pounds per yard. Loose cubic yards will be converted at a standard 300 pounds per cubic yard. Please specify an alternative conversion ratio if one is presently in use in your jurisdiction.



3.6.2 Which cost components are included in these estimates?

All Administration Costs (direct costs in the Solid Waste Program and indirect costs in Clark County Government) are captured in the Clark County Solid Waste Enterprise Fund.

3.6.3 Please describe the funding mechanism(s) that will recover the cost of each component.

Funding for all solid waste system costs (including Administration Costs) comes from several sources as detailed in 3.1.3.

**3.7 Other Programs**

For each program in effect or planned which does not readily fall into one of the previously described categories please answer the following questions. (Make additional copies of this section as necessary.)

3.7.1 Describe the program, or provide a page number reference to the plan.

n/a

3.7.2 Owner/Operator: \_\_\_\_\_

n/a

3.7.3 Is WUTC Regulation Involved? If so, please explain the extent of involvement in section 3.8.

n/a

3.7.4 Please estimate the anticipated costs for this program, including capital and operating expenses.

YR.1 n/a YR.3 n/a YR.6 n/a

3.7.5 Please describe the funding mechanism(s) that will recover the cost of this component.

n/a

**3.8 References and Assumptions** (attach additional sheets as necessary)

n/a

**4. FUNDING MECHANISMS:** This section relates specifically to the funding mechanisms currently in use and the ones which will be implemented to incorporate the recommended programs in the draft plan. Because the way a program is funded directly relates to the costs a resident or commercial customer will have to pay, this section is crucial to the cost assessment process. Please fill in each of the following tables as completely as possible.

Proposed changes in the draft *Clark County Comprehensive Solid Waste and Moderate Risk Waste Management Plan*:

- Evaluation of curbside recycling collection program – the residential curbside collection contract will be rebid with potential changes included as a proposal option; costs/benefits of potential changes will be evaluated at that time
- Improvements to current (private) transfer facilities – these costs are being absorbed in the current transfer station tipping fees; improvements are included in the County's contract with Waste Connections
- Construction of new (private) transfer facility – these costs are being absorbed in the current transfer station tipping fees; improvements are included in the County's contract with Waste Connections
- Enhanced unsecured loads programs – cost impact of enhancing this program will be incremental and these costs will be absorbed in the current County Solid Waste budget
- Registering recycling haulers - cost impact of implementing this program will be incremental and these costs will be absorbed in the current County Solid Waste budget
- Transfer facility ban on accepting moderate risk waste - cost impact of implementing this policy will be incremental to the County and these costs will be absorbed in the current County Solid Waste budget; small quantity generators who are currently using the transfer facilities to dispose of their hazardous waste will incur additional cost for hazardous waste disposal
- Policy limiting construction of landfills in Clark County - cost impact of implementing this policy will be incremental and any associated costs will be absorbed in the current County Solid Waste budget

**Table 4.1.1 Facility Inventory**

Facility Name	Type of Facility	Tip Fee per Ton	Transfer Cost**	Transfer Station Location	Final Disposal Location	Total Tons Disposed	Total Revenue Generated (Tip Fee x Tons)
---------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------	---------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------	--

All transfer stations and the materials recovery facility are privately owned and operated by Waste Connections (d/b/a Columbia Resource Company) under a long-term transfer, transport and disposal contract with Clark County. Tipping fees are paid by the users of the facilities. Tipping fees are set contractually (see table 4.1.4). Tipping fees increase or decrease annually at 82% of the CPI. MRF fees are paid by the county and cities (users of the facility) – these fees are set contractually at \$30/ton and increase or decrease at 82% of the CPI.